



Henry C. Powell
Telephone: (510) 987-0711
Fax: (510) 763-0309
Email: henry.powell@ucop.edu

Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council
Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

March 18, 2010

ED STEWART
ISSUES MANAGEMENT POLICY ANALYSIS AND COORDINATION
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Re: AB 2400

Dear Ed:

The Academic Senate urges the University to strongly oppose AB 2400, which would, if enacted, authorize the Grossmont-Cuyamaca, San Diego, and San Mateo County Community College Districts to establish baccalaureate degree pilot programs. Although the Senate can appreciate the perceived economic need to allow certain community colleges to grant baccalaureate degrees at seemingly lower costs to students, it objects to this proposal primarily on the basis that it would violate the fundamental principles of California's Master Plan for Higher Education, as well as from a cost/resource, quality of instruction, and segmental coordination perspective.

History has shown that the rationale behind the Master Plan, that California's three higher education segments be divided by purpose, function, and resource allocation, to be solid and sound. Indeed, it has provided the state a number of benefits—both in terms of the quality of education provided to California's students, as well as cost savings. The Master Plan designates the following missions for the different segments: The University of California is California's primary academic research institution, and provides undergraduate, graduate and professional education for the state; the California State University (CSU) specializes in undergraduate education and graduate education through the master's degree, including teacher education; and the CCCs primarily provide the academic and vocational instruction for older and younger students through the first two years of undergraduate education (lower division), with a specific emphasis on transfer to UC or the CSU. Such a division has allowed each higher education segment to concentrate on what it does best, and has allowed the state to appropriately fund each segment per its respective missions.

In our view, this bill is predicated on the perception that CCCs can provide a low-cost baccalaureate education to underserved populations in these hard economic times. While it may be true that community colleges have traditionally been well-positioned to provide the first two years of the undergraduate curriculum to individual transfer students, they are wholly lacking the resources to offer the full baccalaureate curriculum en masse, especially in these difficult budgetary times. The

University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) aptly points out that the CCCs will not be able deliver an upper division undergraduate experience without a significant amount of new facilities and expertise. It is highly misleading to apply their current cost-per-student credit hour to the cost of upper division courses that would be needed. Indeed, the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) recently reported that by 2019, the demand for slots at the CCCs is expected to rise by 313,253 students. In addition CPEC noted that the 2009–10 budget does not provide proper enrollment growth funding for California’s community colleges—if the community college system finds it necessary to reduce enrollments by 4%, consistent with the 4% decline in overall funding, the number of prospective students not served could top 365,000 by fall 2010.¹ Adding four-year degree-seeking students to this mix would overburden community colleges to the breaking point. Students would not be able to get the classes that they need, which would inevitably lead to extended time-to-degree beyond four years. In our view, it is inappropriate and irresponsible for community colleges to significantly expand their mission for the foreseeable future, especially when they are not even meeting their primary responsibilities, as spelled out by the Master Plan. A far better solution would be to bolster the funding of already-existing UC and CSU campuses in these areas.

The Senate also objects to this bill from a quality of instruction point of view. It should not escape notice that not all instructors at the CCCs hold earned doctorates, which is the standard at both UC and CSU. Indeed, a significant number of instructors at community colleges only hold masters’ degrees, and are unable to deliver the full breadth of curriculum necessary for a quality undergraduate education. Therefore, transitioning to four-year degrees would require that participating community colleges hire new faculty with PhDs. Second, community colleges simply do not have the capital infrastructure necessary for these degrees, especially with regard to the type of buildings and equipment needed to offer science degrees, as well as sufficient library resources needed for all kinds of undergraduate degrees. A build-out of this kind of infrastructure would take years to complete, and cost the state a significant amount of money that it frankly does not have at this time. It would also duplicate what is already available on UC and CSU campuses.

Finally, at a time when the Legislative Analyst’s Office is issuing calls for better coordination among the segments, we find it odd that this bill undermines such intersegmental coordination. It is interesting that the Intersegmental Council of Academic Senates (ICAS), which has a 30-year track record of solid intersegmental coordination, has not been consulted in any meaningful way on this proposal. UCPB also notes that this proposal has not even been run by CPEC, which is well-positioned to conduct a preliminary analysis of such a proposal. In sum, this kind of legislative interference has the potential to pit campuses, segments, and even legislative districts, against one another.

Thank you for the opportunity to opine on this proposed legislation. If you have any questions regarding the Senate’s comments, please let me know.

Sincerely,



Henry C. Powell, Chair

¹ See [“Ready or Not, Here They Come: Community College Enrollment Demand Projections, 2009–2019”](#) by Stacy Wilson, Mallory Newell, and Ryan Fuller, CPEC, December 2009; and [“16% Rise in Undergrads on California’s State Campuses Predicted,”](#) Carla Rivera, LA Times, March 11, 2010.

Academic Council

Encl: 2

Copy: Academic Council

Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director

Steve Juarez, Associate Vice President & Director, State Governmental Relations

Jenny Kao, Executive Director, IMPAC



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)

Peter Krapp, Chair

krapp@uci.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate

1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor

Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Phone: (510) 987-9466

Fax: (510) 763-0309

March 5, 2010

HENRY POWELL, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Re: State Assembly Bill AB 2400

Dear Harry,

UCPB appreciates the opportunity to comment on State Assembly Bill AB 2400, which would authorize selected community college districts to establish baccalaureate degree pilot programs.

This pilot program is misdirected. The California Community Colleges (CCCs) play a fundamental role in the state's higher education system, a role for which they are not adequately funded. Asking them to do anything more would further compromise, rather than strengthen this role. The CCCs will not be able deliver an upper division undergraduate experience without a significant amount of new facilities and expertise. It is highly misleading to apply their current cost-per-student credit hour to the cost of upper division courses that would be needed. UC's lower division instruction is also cheaper, but nobody is suggesting we should start granting Associate's degrees.

UC has plenty of expertise and capacity for producing bachelor's degrees, and there remains significant potential for growth within both CSU and UC. It makes little sense to duplicate existing institutions, where the comparative advantage does not exist, while defunding those existing institutions. Furthermore, any savings from developing B.A. degrees in the CCCs is likely to be overestimated due to curriculum development and other upfront costs that will come on top of the cost of delivery.

This kind of campus-by-campus legislative meddling will pit one campus against another, and one legislative district against another. Major changes like these should come only after broad consultation with all segments of higher education. We also note that this proposal has not even been run by CPEC.

In short, it would be highly expensive for the state to enable the Community College system to produce quality four-year programs, due to the costs required to hire the necessary number of qualified teachers, and the costs of upgrading the necessary infrastructure (from laboratories to libraries). The state should invest in the existing four-year systems (CSU and UC) that it is currently short-changing rather than sponsor a pilot program to somehow produce four-year programs on the cheap.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Peter Krapp". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Peter" and last name "Krapp" clearly distinguishable.

Peter Krapp
UCPB Chair

cc: UCPB
Martha Winnacker, Senate Executive Director



OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

9500 GILMAN DRIVE
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0002
TELEPHONE: (858) 534-3640
FAX: (858) 534-4528

March 11, 2010

Professor Henry Powell
Chair, Academic Council
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

Subject: State Assembly Bill AB 2400: California Community Colleges – Baccalaureate Degree Pilot Program

Dear Harry,

In response to your request for comments on AB 2400, I strongly reiterate the points made in the April 30, 2009 letter from then-Academic Council Chair Mary Croughan to Director Frank Thomson. The resources needed to build the necessary capital and human infrastructure for the California Community Colleges to provide a quality baccalaureate education to California students seem even more beyond the reach of the State than a year ago. Spending state funds to duplicate effective educational structures already in place seems ill-advised, especially when all three components of the California higher education system are experiencing continued diminishing resources accompanied by increasing enrollment demand.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "W S Hodgkiss".

William S. Hodgkiss, Chair
Academic Senate, San Diego Divisioncc: Divisional Vice Chair Frank Powell
Executive Director Martha Winnacker
Associate Director Todd Giedt